

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Forest Collaborative Research

Economics

6-2019

Devolution and Collective Action in Forest Management: The Case of China - June 2019

Yuanyuan Yi
Peking University

Jintao Xu
Peking University

Gunnar Köhlin
University of Gothenburg

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/fc_research



Part of the [Economic Theory Commons](#), and the [Environmental Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Yi, Yuanyuan; Xu, Jintao; and Köhlin, Gunnar, "Devolution and Collective Action in Forest Management: The Case of China - June 2019" (2019). *Forest Collaborative Research*. 10.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/fc_research/10

This Spring 2019 Meeting Presentation - Manchester, England is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Forest Collaborative Research by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Devolution and Collective Action in Forest Management: The Case of China

Yuanyuan Yi¹, Jintao Xu¹ and Gunnar Köhlin²



¹Peking University

²University of Gothenburg, Sweden




EfD Forest Collaborative Meeting, June 26, 2019

Motivation and Background



- China's Collective Forest Tenure Reform and Main Tenure Types
 - ① *No-reform*: no reform in village, forests collectively owned as before;
 - ② **Household private**: villages adopted the reform and devolved forests to households;
 - ③ **Household-joint**: villages adopted the reform and devolved forests, where some of these households formed joint-management
 - ④ *Village-collective*: villages adopted the reform and collectively manage the forests
- This paper examines: Can further devolution trigger collective action in forest management and benefit member households?
- Data sources:
 - ① Village & household survey in 8 provinces, 2005 and 2010
 - ② MODIS MCD12Q1 on land cover type classification (500m): 2001-2012
 - ③ Landsat 7 32-Day EVI Composite (30m): 1999-2017



Methodology



Treatment Vs. Control



Results: Treatment effect on forest

Table: ATE estimates based on matching

	Coef.	Std.Err.	Obs. (N)	Villages (N)	R-squared
Forest coverage					
Year 0	0.035***	(0.0109)	528	44	0.178
Year 1	0.033**	(0.0110)	528	44	0.175
Year 2	0.020*	(0.0114)	528	44	0.165
Year 3	0.018*	(0.0107)	484	44	0.218
EVI					
Year 0	-0.005	(0.0112)	836	44	0.159
Year 1	0.004	(0.0113)	792	44	0.099
Year 2	0.002	(0.0114)	748	44	0.079
Year 3	0.007	(0.0117)	704	44	0.087
Year 4	0.022**	(0.0121)	660	44	0.091
Year 5	0.015	(0.0127)	616	44	0.074
Year 6	-0.005	(0.0132)	572	44	0.072
Year 7	0.012	(0.0139)	528	44	0.079

Results: Treatment effect on household income

Table: ATE estimates based on matching

	(1) Total income	(2) Relative poverty	(3) Off-farm income	(4) Off-farm income (%)	(5) Farming income	(6) Forest prod. value
Panel A. 2005-2010						
Devolution-based collective action	2,326.304* (1,248.151)	-0.042 (0.074)	2,221.130** (975.002)	0.045 (0.058)	134.895 (330.702)	436.398* (238.614)
R-squared	0.181	0.041	0.164	0.167	0.104	0.080
Observations	586	586	586	586	586	586
Number of household	298	298	298	298	298	298
Panel B. 2000-2010						
Devolution-based collective action	1,821.805 (1,137.009)	-0.024 (0.074)	2,214.822** (928.311)	0.055 (0.056)	154.677 (382.615)	459.397* (256.637)
R-squared	0.246	0.091	0.208	0.121	0.088	0.084
Observations	881	881	881	881	881	881
Number of household	298	298	298	298	298	298
Household FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year trend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes